

### **REMARKS**

This Request for Reconsideration is being submitted in light of the Interview conducted on October 20, 2005 between Applicant's Agent and Examiners Koyama and Frech. Applicant appreciates the Examiners' indication that Independent claims 1 and 5 are patentable over the cited prior art. Claims 1-7 and 9 are pending in this application. Reconsideration of the claims as listed above and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Goss et al. Please note, claim 8 was canceled in a previous response to office action. Claims 2 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Goss et al. and further in view of Allmann. Claims 4 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Goss et al. and further in view of Adams.

During the Interview, the Examiners' indicated that claims 1 and 5 of the present invention are patentable over Smith in view of Goss because Smith teaches or suggests a method and apparatus for identifying a print media type and not properties of a roll that is a functional part of a machine, as claimed in independent claims 1 and 5. Likewise, Goss teaches to measure and detect the properties of a web and not the roll itself which is a functional part of the machine. By reason of their dependency on independent claims 1 and 5, the Applicant asserts that claims 2-4, 6,7, and 9 are also patentable over the cited prior art.

An artisan of ordinary skill in the art would not take media to be printed, even if the media is provided in a roll, and use it for a roll which is a functional part of the machine for producing paper/pulp. Because the media is only processed and printed on by the machine, the media can not be considered or compared to the roll in Goss or Smith. A media roll is not a functional part of the printer.

Therefore, the Applicant asserts that the claims 1-7 and 9 are now patentable. It is respectfully requested that the obviousness rejections be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

In view of the remarks presented above it is submitted that the Examiner's rejections and objections have been overcome and should be withdrawn and the claims should be allowed.


This Request for Reconsideration is being filed with a Request for a two month extension. In the event that any other extensions and/or fees are required for the entry of this Amendment, the Commissioner is specifically authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0518 in the name of Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.

Should any changes to the claims and/or specification be deemed necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to discuss the same.

An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

STEINBERG & RASKIN, P.C.



Noam R. Pollack  
Reg. No. 56,829

Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.  
1140 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
Tel.: (212) 768-3800